

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are the claims currently pending in this Application.

Formal Matters

The Examiner objected to the Specification because of certain informalities, including minor errors and typos. Amended paragraphs of the Specification are submitted herein and therefore the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this objection.

Further, the Examiner objected to the drawings, Figures 11, 15 and 16, because of certain informalities. Filed herewith are Replacement Sheets (Fig. 1-16) to correct the Drawings.

The Examiner requested that an Information Disclosure Statement be filed listing the references on page 1, lines 18-22, of the Specification, pursuant to MPEP § 609A(1).

The cited portion of Applicant's Specification contains a reference to a book, Douglas E. Comer, "Internetworking with TCP/IP Volume I Principles, Protocols and Architecture", Third edition, 1995, Prentice-Hall, Inc. As is clear from the cited portion of Applicant's Specification, the book by Comer was cited as a general background work on DHCP (Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol) and the DNS (Domain Name System), and is available, along with many other similar books in major bookstores and technical libraries.

However, Applicant will review the Comer book to determine whether there are any pages or sections that are pertinent to the subject-matter of Applicant's invention and will file an IDS if necessary.

Further, the Examiner objected to claims 2 and 5-7 because of certain informalities. Claims 2 and 5-7 are amended and therefore the Examiner is requested to

withdraw the objection thereto and allow these claims. These amendment are not narrowing amendments.

The Examiner objected to claims 4, 8 and 10 as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but stated that claims 4, 8 and 10 would be allowable if rewritten as independent claims. Since independent claim 2 is now believed to be allowable, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection to claims 4, 8 and 10 and allow also these claims.

Rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claim 4 is amended. The Examiner is therefore requested to withdraw the rejection and allow claim 4. The amendment to claim 4 is not a narrowing amendment.

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious from Brewer et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,918,016 and Sharony, U.S. Patent No. 5,652,751. This rejection is traversed.

For at least the following reasons, Applicant's claimed invention is neither anticipated by, nor obvious from, the prior art, including Brewer and Sharony. By way of example, Claim 1 requires a mobile terminal wherein an infrastructure network and an ad hoc network are configured in an integrated mode in an address management process and a destination addressed capture process, each process including identifying whether a network to which the mobile terminal is connected is an ad hoc network or an infrastructure network, and then using a procedure corresponding to the connected network. Further, independent claim 2 requires *inter alia*, a mobile terminal connected between an infrastructure network

and an ad hoc network, comprising move management means outputting a transmission packet to manage whether or not the mobile terminal itself has moved from the network.

Brewer discloses a system with a program for automating protocol assignments when newly connected to a computer network. Brewer discloses that when a computer is moved from a network and connected to a new network, the computer is automatically configured for the new network with respect to some configuration parameters. In particular, Brewer discloses that the server of the network (“the foreign network”) transmits the new IP (Internet Protocol) setting information to the computer, and based upon this information from the server the computer is configured. Thus, Brewer discloses that the server of the new network transmits the IP settings information to the newly connected computer.

Brewer does not disclose or suggest an ad hoc network in which there is no integrated server. As discussed, Brewer discloses that the mobile terminal receives from the server of the network to which it is newly connected IP information based upon which the mobile terminal is configured. Indeed, the Examiner acknowledges that Brewer does not disclose an ad hoc network (Office Action, page 5.) Therefore, Brewer is incapable of disclosing or suggesting a mobile terminal wherein a connection procedure for an ad hoc network and an infrastructure network are configured in an integrated mode and then using a procedure corresponding to the connected network (as per claim 1).

The Examiner cites Brewer, col. 4, lines 27-63, and alleges that Brewer discloses these features. As discussed, Brewer discloses that the server of the “new” network (“the foreign network”) transmits the new IP (Internet Protocol) setting information to the computer that is newly moved to the foreign network, and based upon this information from the server, the computer is configured. Brewer does not disclose or suggest that the

connection procedure for an ad hoc network and an infrastructure network are configured in an integrated mode in the mobile terminal.

Further, with respect to claim 2, Brewer does not disclose or suggest a mobile terminal connected between an infrastructure network and an ad hoc network, comprising a move management means that outputs a transmission packet to manage whether or not the mobile terminal has moved from the network. As discussed, Brewer discloses that the foreign network's server transmits the new IP (Internet Protocol) setting information to the computer new to the foreign network, and based upon this information from the server, the computer is configured.

Sharony does not cure the deficiencies of Brewer as they relate to claims 1 and 2. Sharony discloses an architecture for mobile radio networks with dynamically changing topology. Sharony discloses a radio communications network with nodes that are subject to a dynamically changing topology, with nodes grouped into physical and virtual subnets of the radio network. The Examiner alleges that Sharony's network with dynamically changing topology is an ad hoc network.

Applicant respectfully submits that Sharony does not disclose or suggest an ad hoc network, a network with no integrated server, as required by claims 1 and 2. Further, Sharony does not disclose or suggest a mobile terminal wherein a connection procedure for an ad hoc network and an infrastructure network are configured in an integrated mode and then using a procedure corresponding to the connected network (as per claim 1), or a mobile terminal connected between an infrastructure network and an ad hoc network, comprising a move management means that outputs a transmission packet to manage whether or not the mobile terminal has moved from the network.

No Motivation for Combining

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's claimed invention would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art based on Brewer and Sharony, because there would have been no motivation for combining the references. The Examiner, alleges that the motivation for including Sharony's alleged ad hoc network as a second network, "foreign network", of Brewer would have been "to allow mobile terminals to be able to dynamically enter and leave the network in which a wired backbone does not exist." (Office Action, page 6).

However, the Examiner cites no teaching in Brewer or Sharony that would have motivated for a system allowing a mobile terminal to be able to dynamically enter and leave the network in which a wired backbone does not exist. In particular, neither Brewer nor Sharony teaches the desirability of a mobile terminal in an ad hock network to which a mobile terminal is to be connected, such that the mobile terminal has a procedure in an integrated mode (claim 1), or a mobile terminal in an ad hock network to which a mobile terminal is to be connected, such that the mobile terminal comprises means to transmit the transmission packet to manage whether or not the mobile terminal has moved from the network (claim 2). Thus, Applicant's claimed invention would not have been obvious based on Brewer and Sharony.

Claims 3, 5-7 and 9 depend from claim 2, and thus incorporate novel and nonobvious features thereof. Therefore, claims 3, 5-7 and 9 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that claim 2 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

In view of the foregoing discussion, reconsideration and allowance of this Application are believed to be in order, and such action is requested. Should the Examiner have questions regarding this Amendment or this Application generally, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



George Brieger
Registration No. 52,652

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343 ext. 503
GB:eg

Encl – Six sheets of drawings